UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/162,685	09/29/1998	HOWARD JUSTIN GLASER	ST9-98-052	9128

22462 7590 10/02/2002

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER
BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/162,685	Applicant(s) GLASER ET AL.	
	Examiner William L. Bashore	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 July 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 7/11/2002, to the present application filed **9/29/1998**.

2. Claims 2, 13, 24 remain objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

3. The rejection of claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

4. Claims 1-8, 11-19, 22-30, 33-34 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley, Arora, and Francis.

5. Claims 9-10, 20-21, 31-32 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley, Arora, Francis, and Lisle.

6. Claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 1, 12, 23, 34 are independent claims.

Drawings

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Specification

8. **In regard to dependent claims 2, 13, 24**, claims 2, 13, 24 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 1-8, 11-19, 22-30, 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley et al. (hereinafter Foley), U.S. Patent No. 5,706,502 issued January 1998, in view of Arora et al. (hereinafter Arora), U.S. Patent No. 5,911,145 issued June 1999, and in view of Francis et al. (Hereinafter Francis), U.S. Patent No. 6,182,092 issued January 2001.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Foley teaches:

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag (Foley column 2 lines 55-63, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 1 "*reading information from a project file...*".

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a "Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table" (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 1 "*...the information comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page*", and "*from the form*"). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis's taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- processing an applet referenced in each web document (Foley column 5 lines 32-49; compare with claim 1 "*processing the information to map the element to the HTML file*").

- a graphical user interface in the form of a Java Workshop, including presented icon specifications and a toolbar (Foley Figure 1, column 4 lines 28-43). Francis teaches a relationship between form objects within said HTML page as previously discussed, above. Foley does not specifically teach the visual display between mapped elements and an HTML file. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora Abstract, column 10 lines 60-65, column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42). Compare the above with claim 1 "*displaying the mapping on a graphical user interface that includes the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley and Francis, because of the advantage of visibly showing mapped files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

- It is noted that Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "*... an element from a form, wherein the element is in an HTML page, comprising:*". However, Francis still shows both a form, and elements of said form, within an HTML page (Francis column 5 lines 47-52, column 10 lines 17-23, 24-37, and 38-67). In addition, various form element tags are shown within the HTML code presented on column 10 lines 23-36, as well as element names of "FORM" and "INPUT", for the purpose of providing a form in a presented Web page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, providing Foley the benefit of creating project files for various Web pages (i.e. HTML pages combined (embedded) with input forms).

In regard to dependent claim 2, Foley does not specifically teach the use of a form in generating information from said form to an HTML page. However, Francis teaches an HTML page embedded at some point with form objects, and information is generated using a "Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table" (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis's taught advantage of the analysis of embedded forms in order to clearly identify relationships within the portfolio of Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Foley teaches a visual element control (Foley column 6 lines 31-33; compare with claim 3 "*a visual control*", and "*...group comprising a button*").

Foley does not specifically teach selection from a picklist, and a data entry box. However, Arora teaches a picklist and a data entry box (Arora Figure 43; compare with claim 3 "*...a picklist, and a data entry box*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of alternate forms of input that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 4, Foley teaches an element name (Applet2), and an HTML file name (Applet2.htm) (Foley column 10 lines 35-45; compare with claim 4).

In regard to dependent claim 5, Foley teaches an element name (Applet2), and an HTML file name (Applet2.htm) (Foley column 10 lines 35-45). Foley does not specifically teach a form name. However, Francis teaches an HTML element with the name "FORM" (Francis column 10 lines 50-55; compare with claim 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis's taught advantage of form names in order to clearly identify elements within the portfolio of Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Foley does not specifically teach an element name and an HTML name in a row of a table. However, Arora teaches a table comprising rows of names of elements, all of which belong to a products page (Arora column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42; compare with claim 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of showing data in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 7, Foley does not specifically teach row and column cells for entry of a mapping. However, Arora teaches row and column cells for entry of a mapping (Arora Figure 39; compare with claim 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of showing space in a visually organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 8, claim 8 is rejected using the Examiner's argument and rationale as set forth in the rejection of dependent claim 6.

In regard to dependent claim 11, Foley teaches the managing and editing of portfolios comprising different projects (Foley Abstract, at top, column 11 lines 21-26; compare with claim 11).

In regard to independent claim 12, Foley teaches:

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag (Foley

column 2 lines 55-63, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 12 "*means for reading information from a project file...).*

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a "Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table" (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 12 "*...the information comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page* , and "*from the form*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis's taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- processing an applet referenced in each web document (Foley column 5 lines 32-49; compare with claim 12 "*processing the information to map the element to the HTML file*").

- a graphical user interface in the form of a Java Workshop, including presented icon specifications and a toolbar (Foley Figure 1, column 4 lines 28-43). Francis teaches a relationship between form objects within said HTML page as previously discussed, above. Foley does not specifically teach the visual display between mapped elements and an HTML file. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora Abstract, column 10 lines 60-65, column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42). Compare the above with claim 12 "*displaying the mapping on a graphical user interface that includes the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley and Francis, because of the advantage of visibly showing mapped files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

- It is noted that Applicant has amended claim 12 to recite "*... an element from a form, wherein the element is in an HTML page, comprising:*". However, Francis still shows both a form, and elements of said form, within an HTML page (Francis column 5 lines 47-52, column 10 lines 17-23, 24-37, and 38-67). In addition, various form element tags are shown within the HTML code presented on column 10 lines 23-36, as well as element names of "FORM" and "INPUT", for the purpose of providing a form in a presented Web page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, providing Foley the benefit of creating project files for various Web pages (i.e. HTML pages combined (embedded) with input forms).

In regard to claims 13-19, 22, claims 13-19, 22 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 2-8, 11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 23, Foley teaches:

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag (Foley column 2 lines 55-63, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 23 "*reading information from a project file...*").

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a "Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table" (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 23 "*...the information comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page* , and "*from the form*"). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis's taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- processing an applet referenced in each web document (Foley column 5 lines 32-49; compare with claim 23 "*processing the information to map the element to the HTML file*").

- a graphical user interface in the form of a Java Workshop, including presented icon specifications and a toolbar (Foley Figure 1, column 4 lines 28-43). Francis teaches a relationship between form objects within said HTML page as previously discussed, above. Foley does not specifically teach the visual display between mapped elements and an HTML file. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora Abstract, column 10 lines 60-65, column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42). Compare the above with claim 23 "*displaying the mapping on a graphical user interface that includes the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley and Francis, because of the advantage of visibly showing mapped files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to claims 24-30, 33, claims 24-30, 33 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 2-8, 11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 34, Foley teaches:

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag, and said elements of said portfolio can be saved, edited, processed and restored (Foley column 2 lines 55-63,

column 5 lines 32-49, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 34: "*a computer readable data structure....the data structure comprising:*", and "*a first section comprising the executable programming logic needed to load and execute the project application in the computer*").

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a "Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table" (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 34 "... storing information *comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis's taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- Foley does not specifically teach the display of said mapped elements and HTML file shown within a project. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42; compare with claim 34 "*a second section for storing data required to restore the project environment*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of visibly showing mapped files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

- a graphical user interface in the form of a Java Workshop, including presented icon specifications and a toolbar (Foley Figure 1, column 4 lines 28-43). Francis teaches a relationship between form objects within said HTML page as previously discussed, above. Foley does not specifically teach the visual display between mapped elements and an HTML file within a project. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora Abstract, column 10 lines 60-65,

column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42). Compare the above with claim 34 "*wherein the relationship between the element, the form....in a graphical user interface*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley and Francis, because of the advantage of visibly showing mapped files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

11. **Claims 9-10, 20-21, 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley, Arora, and Francis as applied to claims 1, 12, 23 above, and further in view of Lisle et al. (hereinafter Lisle), U.S. Patent No. 6,069,630 issued May 2000.**

In regard to dependent claim 9, Foley does not specifically teach flagging an invalid mapping. However, Lisle teaches the indication of a link depending upon whether a link (element) is good or bad (Lisle Figure 4 item 410; compare with claim 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Lisle to Foley, because of the taught advantage up to date linking that Lisle provides to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 10, claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1 and 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 20-21, claims 20-21 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 9-10, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 31-32, claims 31-32 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 9-10, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Argument

12. Applicant's arguments filed 7/11/2002 as paper No.13, have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant continues to traverses the Examiner's objection of claims 2, 13, 24 under CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant argues on pages 8-9 (section V - Non Art Rejection) of the amendment that dependent claims 2, 13, 24 provide a timing element, therefore providing a further limitation of the independent claims. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that Applicant appears to contradict his own position set forth in Petition Under 37 C.F.R. 1.181 to invoke Supervisory Authority (filed 5/21/2001 as paper #5). Page 2 of said petition states in part:

> *"The Applicants' amendment of the claims merely amended the independent claims to incorporate dependent claim limitations. For example, the independent claims 1, 12, 23 were amended to include a limitation such that the element was transferred from a form to an HTML page and an HTML file associated with the HTML page, which limitation was incorporation from dependent claims 2, 13 and 24 respectively of the application as originally filed".*

Using claims 1, and 2 as an example, the relevant limitation of claim 1 states:

"*reading information from a project file, the information comprising a relationship between the element that has been transferred from the form to the HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page*".

Dependent claim 2 states:

"*The method of claim 1, wherein the information is generated when the element is transferred from the form to the HTML page associated with the HTML file.*"

The Examiner does not see any evidence of claim 2 further limiting the subject matter of independent claim 1. This equally applies to claim 13 (dependent from claim 12), and claim 24 (dependent from claim 23).

Applicant argues on page 12 to page 13 of the amendment that an HTML FORM tag is clearly distinguishable from an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page, a FORM tag element is not equivalent to a form from which elements are transferred into an HTML page. The examiner notes that a form as presently claimed can be interpreted as an input form which can be associated with HTML pages. Since a form is defined by HTML tag elements, the form and its tag data are transferred to said HTML page.

Applicant argues on page 13 of the amendment that Francis's Table is clearly distinguishable from information or a mapping that indicates the transfer from a form (and not an object or a class) to an HTML file associated with the HTML page, as claimed. The examiner notes that Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of said Table. Francis teaches a class identifier identifying an object selected according to a selected tag component (e.g., an HTML tag

name) of the structured language element with reference to said Table (Francis column 4 lines 45-50). Francis teaches HTML tag names as form tag names (Francis column 10 lines 50-60, column 15 lines 40-50), and teaches *"a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page"*.

Applicant argues on page 13 of the amendment that Francis does not teach display in a graphical user interface of a mapping that include relationships. The examiner notes that Foley teaches project files. Francis teaches mapping between HTML form tag elements and an HTML file, and Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42). In additional support of this rejection, Arora teaches a structure editor for Websites, including defining the layout of each page in a site (Arora Abstract). Arora also teaches a page editor including values of Properties window (properties for a displayed page) (Arora column 10 lines 61-67), and a list of draw objects (Arora column 11 lines 7-20).

Applicant argues on pages13-14 the amendment that Foley and Francis do not teach a mapping of elements to an HTML file. The examiner notes that Foley teaches project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag, and Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a "Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table".

Applicant argues on pages 14-15 of the amendment that Arora does not teach display of a mapping of an HTML file. The examiner notes that Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is **(703) 308-5807**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 11:30 AM to 8:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on **(703) 308-5186**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3900**.

15. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or:

(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

William L. Bashore
09/30/2002

JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER